A U M

Point out the "Way"—however dimly, and lost among the host—as does the evening star to those who tread their path in darkness. —*The Voice of the Silence*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXXI **March, 1943** **No. 5**

AN OPEN HEART

WELL meaning and even consecrated humanitarians write and speak of the need for universal brotherhood, basing their appeals on the common religious sense of unity as well as upon practical consideration of the human suffering which results from unbrotherly action, but no modern thinker has even guessed that this doctrine of brotherhood has occult foundations rooted in natural, although superphysical, reality. Brotherhood is not merely a desirable sentiment, an efflorescence of the socially educated man. It is an immutable law which works from within without to shape every expression of intelligence, to define every human relation, and, finally, to limit all actions which are in violation of the essential unity of the human race.

"Who ruled a King may wander earth in rags, for things done and undone": What is this "King" but a unit of the Whole, brought under the law of moral equilibrium to face those aspects of the One Self that, in his high station of ruler, he denied or ignored? This pain we feel, that frustration of purpose, the obstacles of circumstance, are, to the Soul, the voice of the Law, proclaiming the order of life we have neglected, the unity which "will not be contemned of any one."

Given the principles of Karma and Reincarnation, what once was mystery becomes the visible power of moral justice, impersonal, touching all, and working through the natural agencies of human experience. It takes no strained determination of unsupported faith to see the logic of the law of Karma, nor to acknowledge the fitness of cyclic births on earth as the appropriate mode of moral evolution. The over-all applicability of Karma and Reincarnation to the facts of life brings a light that shows the inner connections of all events, and elevates the individual to his true level of a creative potency in Nature.

But after these laws are recognized and admitted, the secrets of moral causation remain to be known. When the mind has satisfied its yearning for a unified picture of the multiform experiences of life, the energies of the soul demand their corresponding field of realization. A whole science of conduct must now be mastered. If the soul is the real actor, and if outward happenings and doings are simply reflections of choices made by the soul, then the nature of the soul, and its dynamic relation to the body and its powers, must be understood.

Is a man more subtly joined to his fellows than by the ties of family, community, nation and race? Has he with them a consubstantiality of feeling, of mind and heart? Are there graded levels of psychic unity, intimately binding together and determining the interactions of all men?

The teachings of Anton Mesmer, repeated and placed in a philosophical context by H. P. Blavatsky, imply that such levels of unity exist. The terminals of individuality are not the body and its members, but invisible psychic radii which are in constant contact with other individuals. Each flush of feeling, gross or benign, imparts its psychic impetus to others. Every principle of man's nature has its natural medium of inter-relation. Starting from the spiritual identity of all selves, and passing down the scale of differentiation, there is, first, the unity of *knowledge*. Knowledge is participated in by all men in some measure, each in his own degree, according to self-realization. Substantially, it is the presence in every man of the Akasic essence, the very stuff of knowledge or Wisdom, which unites in one fraternity the sages and perfected men of every age. One in their spiritual being, they become hierarchically united in manifested existence through their possession of the One Truth. Their hearts, wherein meet will, knowledge and compassion, are the links of this great band of Brothers. They are perfect because nought but their sense of oneness with the whole keeps them in manifestation. Unwilling to accept the bliss of absolute unity while other units still strive with their own ignorance, these Great Ones preserve in themselves the pattern of achievement, and so are indeed, the Way, the Truth and the Light.

Lesser men are bound by lesser unities and revolve upon the wheel of rebirth in exact correspondence to the principles which animate their lives. The angry insistence of passion may close the door to a higher communion of soul, forging chains of particular affinity that last through many births. Pride may raise a man above his fellows, but even as he soars on the wings of disdain the weight of personal

egotism turns to lead the very qualities which made him, in his own eyes, "superior."

The feeling we have for our fellows anon saves and anon damns, for as a man feels toward others, so are the alliances of Karma established. The sensitive soul who finds himself cast among a crowd of illiterates, coarse men, with, so he thinks, "nothing in common" with him, is thus confronted by his own higher "coarseness" of the past, the arrogance which made him believe he had no duty toward such as they. What shall he "feel" now? Currents of disgust may swirl through his psychic organism, old and recurring habits of condemnation demand an outlet. They may be suppressed merely through timidity, or a veil of caution be drawn over the contempt which rises in this alien heart. What Karma now is generated? Another, wiser, reaction would be to invest the experience with a deeper understanding of the ages of injustice necessary to have produced such brutalized natures. Let him hear the jibes, the ill-natured responses of abused animal nature, remembering the *elemental* character of the principles which speak through men in bitterness and distrust—and let him earn the honorable place of teacher, which once was his, now lost by repeated cycles of irresponsibility.

The passing sneer, the epithet of revulsion, and their psychic correlations—sentimental, separative attachments for a handful of intimates: these are failures of the heart to recognize its own. Sinews of caste exclusiveness, such feelings attract the inarticulate resentment of the masses, and in turn the defences of privilege and special right are erected with an arrogance now "justified" by events. Conflicting and degrading unities are perpetuated by hypocrisy on the one hand, and by sullen hate on the other, until only the solvent of intense and uninterrupted suffering will reduce these barriers and allow the common humanity of all to be recognized.

"We stand bewildered before the mystery of our own making and the riddles of life *we will not* solve, and then accuse the great Sphinx of devouring us." We make these mysteries, primarily, with the feelings from which our conduct develops. Carelessly closing their hearts, men fashion the molds of separateness in thought and act, often cherishing these forms as embodiments of righteousness. For thousands of years the Church has been regarded as a "spiritual" institution, yet no organization of men has been so effective in setting men and nations at each other's throats. Feelings of fear, of weakness, of pride and egotism, built the Church. The same feelings support institutional religion today. The very dogmas which assert sacerdotal lies so unblushingly are surrounded by the spurious rever-

ence of priestcraft, and still deceive by their sovereignty over the feeling nature of the millions who believe them.

The feelings men harbor are hourly shaping the destiny of the human race. Yet how few there are, except theosophists, who know that thoughts now brooded and raised in the feeling nature are predestining the paths of action in the future! Each embodied soul is a living, vibrating center, continuously emitting the unspoken attractions and repulsions of his inner life. Hearts are joined and hearts are rent asunder by these feelings.

The play of regret about things of the past may weave a curtain that will hide the dawning of cycles yet unborn, leaving generations in a darkness that need not have been. Strong souls, free from delusive longings and the snares of unrealized dreams, undistracted by petty, personal antipathies, are needed to pierce the gloom inherited from centuries of misguided feeling. A penetrating awareness of the obstacles to be overcome must guide a sympathy more profound than mere goodness or emotional religiosity—of feelings of this sort we have had more than enough. The feeling that will reach and arouse the hearts of others is rather an impersonal warmth that grows without attention and works its way without announcement. It is the "field" of fraternity in spirit which every earnest lover of his fellows carries about with him. Simply the resolve to see in other men—all of them—the souls that once they knew, but now forget, will open channels of the heart. How can we tell what ancient sadness begins to dissipate under the rays of a friendly smile,—what weakness is assailed once more, because of some friendly encouragement founded on the *soul* point of view.

No personal revelation is required to open the heart. One need only turn in another direction from the personal, see "over the head" of the personality. As this becomes a habit, others will soon become far more interesting than ourselves; not, as might be with a modern psychologist, in the character of "subjects" to be examined and studied or catalogued like so many insects; nor, a soul to be "saved," with the presumptuous intrusion of the evangelist; but simply as people of deep needs, who suffer the profound tragedy of not knowing what they lack, nor where to search. Only a few, it is true, will seek to the very end, and find the same sort of recompense for their striving that has moved the heart of the aspirant. But in this cycle the truth will never be sought by crowds. The many will find the way only after it has been discovered and widened by the few.

The brotherhood taught by Theosophy is brotherhood illumined with knowledge. The light of truth reaches into the dark corners of

life and reveals the working of the law, and the reality of brotherhood thereupon becomes manifest. The feelings that man generates are felt and known for what they are; he knows the heritage of each fleeting desire, whence it came and its potency for good or ill. No man with knowledge can look himself in the eye and fail to recognize the unworthiness of feelings that originate in the lower nature. He knows how those feelings will affect others, how they will tear and drag at the weak places in the character of men with less knowledge and less responsibility. He knows, also, of the gentle, searching, and healing power of feelings that grow from looking upon mankind as a host of souls. No logician's wit can argue these things, no philosopher's demonstration is needed to "prove" the immediate perceptions of reflecting self-consciousness. Open-hearted honesty with one's self brings open-heartedness for all, and the feelings which make of a man a blessing to all who know him.

The sage is a child with children, a scholar with the learned, and a brave man in the company of warriors. He is all things to all men because he is at peace with them all; he casts no one out of his heart. His feelings are always in harmony with the uniting principle of mankind. Wherever he comes, he acts, not out of the past, nor of the future, but from a vision of eternity forever new and incorruptible. His knowledge guides the impulses which flow from the heart, and they find their natural resting place in others, according to their feeling and perceptive power.

Discipleship is but the dawning realization of that vision of eternity, gleaming over the horizon of human existence, casting long rays of encouragement and promise to the aspirant. To the mind, it unfolds the relative unities of all that live, displayed in mighty panorama, complete, all parts connected by the fires of life, yet infinitely diverse in degrees of being and regulated relations under law. To the heart, it is a feeling that comes from a higher world, untouched by the cravings of matter, unsustained by anything save itself. Like a divine descent, it shines through the eyes of mortal man, making him, for the moment, a god. It surges through him, encompassing his whole being, and, unlike the psychic enthusiasms of the personality, this feeling of divine compassion strengthens the will and brings certainty to the discrimination.

One who has seen this vision, if only as in a dream, no more will question wearily for proofs that he has "lived before," nor tax with injustice the natural order. He has reached into the soul of things, has won a glimpse of that which wise men speak of but cannot give away. He is beginning to open his heart.

CHELAS AND LAY CHELAS

AS the word *Chela* has, among others, been introduced by Theosophy into the nomenclature of Western metaphysics, and the circulation of our magazine is constantly widening, it will be as well if some more definite explanation than heretofore is given with respect to the meaning of this term and the rules of Chelaship, for the benefit of our European if not Eastern members. A "Chela" then, is one who has offered himself or herself as a pupil to learn practically the "hidden mysteries of Nature and the psychical powers latent in man." The spiritual teacher to whom he proposes his candidature is called in India a *Guru;* and the real Guru is always an Adept in the Occult Science. A man of profound knowledge, exoteric and esoteric, especially the latter; and one who has brought his carnal nature under subjection of the WILL; who has developed in himself both the power (*Siddhi*) to control the forces of nature, and the capacity to probe her secrets by the help of the formerly latent but now active powers of his being:—this is the real Guru. To offer oneself as a candidate for Chelaship is easy enough, to develop into an Adept the most difficult task any man could possibly undertake. There are scores of "natural-born" poets, mathematicians, mechanics, statesmen, etc., but a natural-born Adept is something practically impossible. For, though we do hear at very rare intervals of one who has an extraordinary innate capacity for the acquisition of occult knowledge and power, yet even he has to pass the self-same tests and probations, and go through the same self-training as any less endowed fellow aspirant. In this matter it is most true that there is no royal road by which favourites may travel.

For centuries the selection of Chelas—outside the hereditary group within the *gon-pa* (temple)—has been made by the Himalayan Mahatmas themselves from among the class—in Tibet, a considerable one as to number—of natural mystics. The only exceptions have been in the cases of Western men like Fludd, Thomas Vaughan, Paracelsus, Pico di Mirandolo, Count St. Germain, etc., whose temperamental affinity to this celestial science more or less forced the distant Adepts to come into personal relations with them, and enabled them to get such small (or large) proportion of the whole truth as was possible under their social surroundings. From Book IV of

---

NOTE.—This article by H. P. Blavatsky first appeared in the Supplement to *The Theosophist* for July, 1883.

Kiu-te, Chapter on "the Laws of Upasans," we learn that the qualifications expected in a Chela were:—

1. Perfect physical health;
2. Absolute mental and physical purity;
3. Unselfishness of purpose; universal charity; pity for all animate beings;
4. Truthfulness and unswerving faith in the law of Karma, independent of any power in nature that could interfere: a law whose course is not to be obstructed by any agency, not to be caused to deviate by prayer or propitiatory exoteric ceremonies;
5. A courage undaunted in every emergency, even by peril to life;
6. An intuitional perception of one's being the vehicle of the manifested Avalokitesvara or Divine Atman (Spirit);
7. Calm indifference for, but a just appreciation of everything that constitutes the objective and transitory world, in its relation with, and to, the invisible regions.

Such, at the least, must have been the recommendations of one aspiring to perfect Chelaship. With the sole exception of the 1st, which in rare and exceptional cases might have been modified, each one of these points has been invariably insisted upon, and all must have been more or less developed in the inner nature by the Chela's UNHELPED EXERTIONS, before he could be actually put to the test.

When the self-evolving ascetic—whether in, or outside the active world—had placed himself, according to his natural capacity, above, hence made himself master of, his (1) *Sarira*—body; (2) *Indriya*—senses; (3) *Dosha*—faults; (4) *Dukkha*—pain; and is ready to become one with his *Manas*—mind; *Buddhi*—intellection, or spiritual intelligence; and *Atma*—highest soul, *i.e.,* spirit. When he is ready for this, and, further, to recognize in *Atma* the highest ruler in the world of perceptions, and in the will, the highest executive energy (power), then may he under the time-honoured rules, be taken in hand by one of the Initiates. He may then be shown the mysterious path at whose thither end the Chela is taught the unerring discernment of *Phala,* or the fruits of causes produced, and given the means of reaching *Apavarga*—emancipation, from the misery of repeated births (in whose determination the ignorant has no hand), and thus of avoiding *Pretya-bhava*—transmigration.

But since the advent of the Theosophical Society, one of whose arduous tasks it was to re-awaken in the Aryan mind the dormant memory of the existence of this science and of those transcendent human capabilities, the rules of Chela selection have become slightly relaxed in one respect. Many members of the Society becoming con-

vinced by practical proof upon the above points, and rightly enough thinking that if other men had hitherto reached the goal, they too if inherently fitted, might reach it by following the same path, pressed to be taken as candidates. And as it would be an interference with Karma to deny them the chance of at least beginning—since they were so importunate, they were given it. The results have been far from encouraging so far, and it is to show these unfortunates the cause of their failure as much as to warn others against rushing heedlessly upon a similar fate, that the writing of the present article has been ordered. The candidates in question, though plainly warned against it in advance, began wrong by selfishly looking to the future and losing sight of the past. They forgot that they had done nothing to deserve the rare honour of selection, nothing which warranted their expecting such a privilege; that they could boast of none of the above enumerated merits. As men of the selfish, sensual world, whether married or single, merchants, civilian or military employees, or members of the learned professions, they had been to a school most calculated to assimilate them to the animal nature, least so to develope their spiritual potentialities. Yet each and all had vanity enough to suppose that their case would be made an exception to the law of countless centuries' establishment as though, indeed, in their person had been born to the world a new *Avatar!* All expected to have hidden things taught, extraordinary powers given them because—well, because they had joined the Theosophical Society. Some had sincerely resolved to amend their lives, and give up their evil courses: we must do them that justice, at all events.

All were refused at first, Col. Olcott, the President, himself, to begin with: and as to the latter gentleman there is now no harm in saying that he was not formally accepted as a Chela until he had proved by more than a year's devoted labours and by a determination which brooked no denial, that he might safely be tested. Then from all sides came complaints—from Hindus, who ought to have known better, as well as from Europeans who, of course, were not in a condition to know anything at all about the rules. The cry was that unless at least a few Theosophists were given the chance to try, the Society could not endure. Every other noble and unselfish feature of our programme was ignored—a man's duty to his neighbour, to his country, his duty to help, enlighten, encourage and elevate those weaker and less favoured than he; all were trampled out of sight in the insane rush for adeptship. The call for phenomena, phenomena, phenomena, resounded in every quarter, and the Founders were impeded in their real work and teased importunately to intercede

with the Mahatmas, against whom the real grievance lay, though their poor agents had to take all the buffets. At last, the word came from the higher authorities that a few of the most urgent candidates should be taken at their word. The result of the experiment would perhaps show better than any amount of preaching what Chelaship meant, and what are the consequences of selfishness and temerity. Each candidate was warned that he must wait for years in any event, before his fitness could be proven, and that he must pass through a series of tests that would bring out all there was in him, whether bad or good. They were nearly all married men and hence were designated "Lay Chelas"—a term new in English, but having long had its equivalent in Asiatic tongues. A Lay Chela is but a man of the world who affirms his desire to become wise in spiritual things. Virtually, every member of the Theosophical Society who subscribes to the second of our three "Declared Objects" is such; for though not of the number of true Chelas, he has yet the possibility of becoming one, for he has stepped across the boundary-line which separated him from the Mahatmas, and has brought himself, as it were, under their notice. In joining the Society and binding himself to help along its work, he has pledged himself to act in some degree in concert with those Mahatmas, at whose behest the Society was organized, and under whose conditional protection it remains. The joining is then, the introduction; all the rest depends entirely upon the member himself, and he need never expect the most distant approach to the "favor" of one of our Mahatmas, or any other Mahatmas in the world—should the latter consent to become known—that has not been fully earned by personal merit. The *Mahatmas are the servants, not the arbiters of the Law of Karma.* LAY-CHELASHIP CONFERS NO PRIVILEGE UPON ANY ONE EXCEPT THAT OF WORKING FOR MERIT UNDER THE OBSERVATION OF A MASTER. And whether that Master be or be not seen by the Chela makes no difference whatever as to the result: his good thoughts, words and deeds will bear their fruits, his evil ones, theirs. To boast of Lay Chelaship or make a parade of it, is the surest way to reduce the relationship with the Guru to a mere empty name, for it would be *primâ facie* evidence of vanity and unfitness for farther progress. And for years we have been teaching everywhere the maxim "First deserve, then desire" intimacy with the Mahatmas.

Now there is a terrible law operative in nature, one which cannot be altered, and whose operation clears up the apparent mystery of the selection of certain "Chelas" who have turned out sorry specimens

of morality, these few years past. Does the reader recall the old proverb, "Let sleeping dogs lie"? There is a world of occult meaning in it. No man or woman knows his or her moral strength until it is *tried.* Thousands go through life very respectably, because they were never put to the pinch. This is a truism doubtless, but it is most pertinent to the present case. One who undertakes to try for Chelaship by that very act rouses and lashes to desperation every sleeping passion of his animal nature. For this is the commencement of a struggle for the mastery in which quarter is neither to be given nor taken. It is, once for all, "To be, or Not to be"; to conquer, means ADEPTSHIP; to fail, an ignoble Martyrdom; for to fall victim to lust, pride, avarice, vanity, selfishness, cowardice, or any other of the lower propensities, is indeed ignoble, if measured by the standard of true manhood. The Chela is not only called to face all latent evil propensities of his nature, but, in addition, the whole volume of maleficent power accumulated by the community and nation to which he belongs. For he is an integral part of those aggregates, and what affects either the individual man, or the group (town or nation) reacts upon the other. And in this instance his struggle for goodness jars upon the whole body of badness in his environment, and draws its fury upon him. If he is content to go along with his neighbours and be almost as they are—perhaps a little better or somewhat worse than the average—no one may give him a thought. But let it be known that he has been able to detect the hollow mockery of social life, its hypocrisy, selfishness, sensuality, cupidity and other bad features, and has determined to lift himself up to a higher level, at once he is hated, and every bad, or bigoted, or malicious nature sends at him a current of opposing will power. If he is innately strong he shakes it off, as the powerful swimmer dashes through the current that would bear a weaker one away. But in this moral battle, if the Chela has one single hidden blemish—do what he may, it *shall* and *will* be brought to light. The varnish of conventionalities which "civilization" overlays us all with must come off to the last coat, and the Inner Self, naked and without the slightest veil to conceal its reality, is exposed. The habits of society which hold men to a certain degree under moral restraint, and compel them to pay tribute to virtue by seeming to be good whether they are so or not, these habits are apt to be all forgotten, these restraints to be all broken through under the strain of chelaship. He is now in an atmosphere of illusions—*Maya.* Vice puts on its most alluring face, and the tempting passions try to lure the inexperienced aspirant to the depths of psychic debasement. This is not a case like that depicted

by a great artist, where Satan is seen playing a game of chess with a man upon the stake of his soul, while the latter's good angel stands beside him to counsel and assist. For the strife is in this instance between the Chela's Will and his carnal nature, and Karma forbids that any angel or Guru should interfere until the result is known. With the vividness of poetic fancy Bulwer Lytton has idealised it for us in his *Zanoni,* a work which will ever be prized by the occultist; while in his *Strange Story* he has with equal power shown the black side of occult research and its deadly perils. Chelaship was defined, the other day, by a Mahatma as a "psychic resolvent, which eats away all dross and leaves only the pure gold behind." If the candidate has the latent lust for money, or political chicanery, or materialistic scepticism, or vain display, or false speaking, or cruelty, or sensual gratification of any kind, the germ is almost sure to sprout; and so, on the other hand, as regards the noble qualities of human nature. The real man comes out. Is it not the height of folly, then, for any one to leave the smooth path of common-place life to scale the crags of chelaship without some reasonable feeling of certainty that he has the right stuff in him? Well says the Bible: "Let him that standeth take heed lest he fall"—a text that would-be Chelas should consider well before they rush headlong into the fray! It would have been well for some of our Lay-Chelas if they had thought twice before defying the tests. *We call to mind several sad failures within a twelvemonth.* One went bad in the head, recanted noble sentiments uttered but a few weeks previously, and became a member of a religion he had just scornfully and unanswerably proven false. A second became a defaulter and absconded with his employer's money—the latter also a Theosophist. A third gave himself up to gross debauchery, and confessed it with ineffectual sobs and tears, to his chosen Guru. A fourth got entangled with a person of the other sex and fell out with his dearest and truest friends. A fifth showed signs of mental aberration and was brought into Court upon charges of discreditable conduct. A sixth shot himself to escape the consequences of criminality, on the verge of detection! And so we might go on and on. All these were apparently sincere searchers after truth, and passed in the world for respectable persons. Externally, they were fairly eligible as candidates for Chelaship, as appearances go; but "within all was rottenness and dead men's bones." The world's varnish was so thick as to hide the absence of the true gold underneath; and the "resolvent" doing its work, the candidate proved in each instance but a gilded figure of moral dross, from circumference to core. . . .

In what precedes we have, of course, dealt but with the failures among Lay-Chelas; there have been partial successes too, and these are passing gradually through the first stages of their probation. Some are making themselves useful to the Society and to the world in general by good example and precept. If they persist, well for them, well for us all: the odds are fearfully against them, but still "there is no Impossibility to him who WILLS." The difficulties in Chelaship will never be less until human nature changes and a new sort is evolved. St. Paul (Rom. vii, 18, 19) might have had a Chela in mind when he said "to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do." And in the wise Kirátárjuniya of Bharávi it is written:—

> "The enemies which rise within the body,
> Hard to be overcome—the evil passions—
> Should manfully be fought; *who conquers these*
> *Is equal to the conqueror of worlds.*" (XI, 32.)

If a man would follow in the steps of Hermetic philosophers he must be ready for everlasting encounters with friends and foes. He must part, once for all, with every remembrance of his earlier ideas, on all and on everything. Existing religions, knowledge, science, must rebecome a blank book for him, as in the days of his babyhood, for if he wants to succeed he must learn a new alphabet on the lap of Mother Nature, every letter of which will afford a new insight to him, every syllable and word an unexpected revelation. The two hitherto irreconcilable foes, science and theology—the Montecchi and Capuletti of the ninetenth century—will ally themselves with the ignorant masses agains the the modern Occultist. To science it will be the duty—arid and sterile as a matter of course—of the Kabalist to prove that from the beginning of time there was but one positive science—Occultism; that it was the mysterious lever of all intellectual forces, the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil of the allegorical paradise, from whose gigantic trunk sprang in every direction boughs, branches and twigs, the former shooting forth straight enough at first, the latter deviating with every inch of growth, assuming more and more fantastical appearances, till at last one after the other lost its vital juice, got deformed, and, drying up, finally broke off, scattering the ground afar with heaps of rubbish. Furthermore, the Occultist will have to prove to Christian theology, publicly, what many of its priesthood are well aware of in secret, namely, that their God on earth was a Kabalist, the meek representative of a tremendous Power.

—H. P. B.

COMPROMISE IN SCIENCE AND RELIGION

(Concluded)

ANOTHER phase of the transient unity between science and religion in the early nineteenth century is represented by the Deist philosophy of the Founding Fathers. This is of importance today, when popular writers like Walter Lippmann and Dorothy Thompson are claiming that the classical and religious background of the great first Americans is lacking from present-day culture. These sentiments are occasionally echoed by spokesmen for the back-to-religion movement. But it is seldom noted, as Harry Elmer Barnes remarks in his *History and Social Intelligence,* that *"the majority of distinguished Americans in the generation of the Fathers were not even professing Christians."* Dr. Barnes quotes from a sermon printed in 1831, in which the Rev. Dr. Wilson deplores the fact that most of the founders of our country were "infidels," and that *"of the first seven presidents not one of them had professed his belief in Christianity."* Citing Remsburg's *Six Historic Americans,* Dr. Barnes justifies the preacher's plaint that "God had been deliberately excluded from the origins of our government":

> . . . the Constitution was framed and God was neglected. He was not merely forgotten. He was absolutely voted out of the Constitution. The proceedings, as published by Thompson, the secretary, and the history of the day, show that the question was gravely debated whether God should be in the Constitution or not, and after a solemn debate he was deliberately voted out of it. . . . There is not only in the theory of our government no recognition of God's laws and sovereignty, but its practical operation, its administration, has been conformable to its theory. Those who have been called to administer the government have not been men making any public profession of Christianity. Washington was a man of valor and wisdom. He was esteemed by the whole world as a great and good man but he was not a professing Christian.

The Founding Fathers were really the inheritors of the Deist tradition that gained currency during the seventeenth century. One of the more important Deists of this earlier period, John Toland, wrote of the practice of the ancient philosophers "to set forth an exoteric and an esoteric teaching, of which the former was intended for the general public, but the latter only for the circle of initiated disciples." (Lange, *History of Materialism* I, 324.) In his treatise, *Clidophorus,* the "key-bearer," he says: "I have more than once

hinted that *the External and Internal Doctrine* are as much now in use as ever; tho' the distinction is not so openly and professedly approv'd as among the Antients." This is not to suggest that Washington was of necessity a believer in Toland's views, but simply to show the quality of Deist thought, which is present also in the great deists of a century or more later.

Deism, like Emersonian idealism, was fated to give way to the externally more impressive "proofs" of scientific materialism. The synthesis of the nineteenth century was inadequate to the heavy artillery of men such as Darwin and Huxley, or, to be more accurate, to the unceasing sniping at metaphysics and moral philosophy which raised to prominence the lesser minds who transmitted evolutionary theory to the masses.

Today, while a world-wide social cataclysm rages about their heads, the serious men of the age are desperately trying to devise a philosophy that will give them the faith to go on and to hope for better days. Urged on by the terrifying catharsis of war, the weaker of the scientific fraternity are opening the door to traditional religion, on the theory that we *must* have some stabilizing influence. The Catholics, of course, are saying "I told you so," and insisting that they have had the solution all along. The enlightened men of religion, however, are more cautious, at the same time more conscious of the extremity of the situation. Some thoughtful criticisms of "Our Moral Chaos" are provided by Willard L. Sperry, Dean of Harvard Divinity School. His first comment is on the war:

> We have probably outgrown the idea of "holy wars," though a decently good conscience is still morally necessary to the waging of a war. Victorious self-righteousness is likely to make a bad peace. From a religious standpoint, it is almost impossible to see how any new world is ever to be set up if the self-righteousness of great states is allowed to persist undisciplined. The world of politics can hardly afford to say these things; the world of religion cannot afford not to say them.

In this statement of a leading Christian there is quite a step of progress. Historical research has shown that Christians were most persistent of any of the groups demanding the conquest of the Philippines in 1898, on the ground that by taking these South Pacific islands Americans could better carry to the natives the truths of Christ! Similarly, President McKinley, after a night spent in pondering the problem of whether or not to seize the Spanish possession, announced that God had instructed him to go ahead. Today we see where the march of Christian progress has led us. Fortunately for

their own Karma, protagonists of Christianity no longer ask for bayonets to clear the way for the process of conversion.

After developing the weaknesses of scientific positivism as the source of ethical guidance, Dr. Sperry proceeds:

> If there is any single conclusion to be drawn from our present dilemma it is that morality alone cannot make a religion, and that behind any ethical system that is to have a religious quality about it there must be an act of faith and a body of beliefs. The way we behave is determined by judgments of value that we pass on the world and on our own experience, and by some long-range guess as to the meaning of life. Those of us, therefore, who hoped forty years ago to keep the ethics of Jesus and to let his "religion" go were wrong. That apparently cannot be done. The reason for behaving in the ways that Jesus proposes, and beyond that, the actual ability to behave thus, are derived from the belief that there is a God. It is said, "One is your Father and all ye are brethren." We tried to realize the second of these propositions in neglect of the first. It begins to look as though we should have to go back to the major premise if we expect the ethics of Jesus to work.

It is at this point that Julian Huxley enters a strenuous objection. The analysis, in the abstract, is accurate enough. In theosophical terms, without the first Fundamental Proposition of *The Secret Doctrine,* brotherhood is an idea without any substantial support. Further, without any teaching at all concerning the destiny of the soul, and the nature of immortality, there is no real *reason* for morality. As Mr. Judge wrote years ago in *The Ocean of Theosophy:* "For alone in reincarnation is the answer to all the problems of life, and in it and Karma is the force that will make men pursue in fact the ethics they have in theory." He adds: "It is the aim of the old philosophy to restore this doctrine [reincarnation] to whatsoever religion has lost it; and hence we call it the 'lost chord of Christianity'."

But will Dr. Sperry recognize its ancient harmony, realize that Reincarnation, and not God the personal Father, is what modern ethics, Christian or otherwise, needs in order to survive the ravages of scepticism and lip profession? The learned Dean is urbane, pleasantly sophisticated, wisely tolerant, but "God the Father" still entrances his otherwise thoughtful mind. Like so many other good men, he probably has never given any serious thought to alternative possibilities. There is wisdom in much of what he writes:

> The world will never get its moral universals back until it again finds something like a religious faith. Of course man cannot compel himself to believe this or that article of faith by a fiat act of his will,

> but he can, at least, put himself in a believing attitude toward things. He can refuse to be contentedly agnostic. That, after all, is what has been wrong with modern man, not his agnosticism—for there is a strong strain of agnosticism in every religion—but his complacent contentment with that agnosticism. Job came to the point when he decided to give up bothering his head about the mystery of life and the world. But just when he had reached this comfortable solution of his difficulties, the Lord spoke to him out of a whirlwind and told him to stand on his feet and answer like a man. It rather seems as though out of the gales of modern history a voice were trying to say the same thing to us.

The analogy of Job is a pertinent one, for if, as H. P. Blavatsky wrote, the book of Job is a treatise on Initiation, the world of today stands on the threshold of another epoch of Manasic life, and, like Job, is being tossed by the whirlwinds of the trial which must precede a new awakening. The transition age is upon us, and like Job, the time has come for us to choose a philosophy of life that has truth in it—to choose, or, as always happens to the lukewarm, the apathetic and the careless, to be destroyed.

Another important problem is raised and faced by Dr. Sperry:

> Ethically our situation is even more difficult. All great world religions have, in their moral regimens, a strong strain of world denial or world renunciation. This negative quality has been, as a matter of fact, the fulcrum by which they have proposed to move history. But the natural man tends to world affirmation. How to square these rival ethics is a stubborn riddle—perhaps an insoluble riddle. But it cannot be shirked.

Nor has it been shirked—by Theosophy. A Theosophical Teacher has written:

> Why has that struggle ["the struggle for life"] become almost the universal scheme of the universe? We answer: because no religion, with the exception of Buddhism, has taught a practical contempt for this earthly life; while each of them, always with that one solitary exception, has through its hells and damnations inculcated the greatest dread of death. Therefore do we find that struggle for life raging most fiercely in Christian countries, most prevalent in Europe and America. It weakens in the Pagan lands, and is nearly unknown among Buddhist populations (THEOSOPHY X, 70).

The "world affirmation" taught by Theosophy is found in the Kwan Yin Pledge—never to seek escape from the world at the expense of our brothers, but always to seek to make the world a better place for them, that they may learn all the lessons that life holds. *That* is the positive acceptance of life here by Theosophy—resolution of the ethical dilemma inevitably confronting all religions which

teach personal salvation as the highest good. Humanitarians cannot accept such a religion, and in default of anything else they become materialists.

Dr. Sperry concludes by appeal to the Emersonian theory that every reform was first an idea in the mind of a private individual. He urges that thoughtful men form "cells" in their communities, to attempt to work out some religious solution by actually testing their ideas in practice. This, again, is what Theosophists have always maintained to be the only way for social reforms to be accomplished, and their study groups and meetings have for years been carrying out this part of Dr. Sperry's program. . . . Not in behalf of a Christian revival, however, but toward the rebirth of the Wisdom-Religion in the hearts of men.

We may be thankful for such men as Julian Huxley and Dr. Sperry. The one clearly perceives the religious need of the world, the other as clearly sees the danger in that great vice of religion, the personal God idea. It is natural, in a transition age, that the leaders of society should present unresolved conflicts in their best thought, and a unity before the time of natural ripening of the cycle would be a specious compromise by both. When scientists acknowledge the soul and its immortal life, and when theologians bid goodbye forever to the "heavenly father," then may we hope for a Religion of the Future, founded on the teachings of Theosophy. Meanwhile, the trends of thought on both sides of the controversy need to be examined for both the good and the evil in them, lest the world be betrayed by their weaknesses, or, on the other hand, ignore entirely the values that are slowly emerging.

Polarizations of Religion

Theosophy, on earth, is like the white ray of the spectrum, and every religion only one of the seven prismatic colours. Ignoring all the others, and cursing them as false, every special coloured ray claims not only priority, but to be *that white ray itself,* and anathematizes even its own tints from light to dark, as heresies. Yet, as the sun of truth rises higher and higher on the horizon of man's perception, and each coloured ray gradually fades out until it is finally re-absorbed in its turn, humanity will at last be cursed no longer with artificial polarizations, but will find itself bathing in the pure colourless sunlight of eternal truth. And this will be *Theosophia.*

—H. P. B.

"SELFISH" AND "UNSELFISH"

QUESTION: A favorite modern assertion is that all action is basically "selfish" and what we call altruism or unselfishness is but another form of egoism. This view seems to have much psychological evidence to support it and is difficult to meet simply by saying that altruism is an expression of the "Higher Self." What would be a Theosophical definition of these terms "selfish" and "unselfish," and how might we deal with this whole question?

Answer: The Theosophical teaching, denying as it does man's origin in either matter or a personal god, asserts a philosophy of free will. All actions begin with "self"—the moral and mental individuality. The implications of the First and Third Fundamental Propositions of the Secret Doctrine are, however, that in essence all individual selves are identical, each unit in the sea of life expressing the same inherent capacity to evolve higher forms. The destiny of "self" as an individual can never, then, be divorced from the evolutionary growth of all forms imbued with Life or Spirit. Each self or soul evolves through a series of progressive awakenings in which its interdependence with other selves becomes ever more clearly perceived.

The term, *selfish,* as commonly used, indicates pursuance of a line of thought and conduct stemming from ignorance of the individual's responsibility to fellow beings in evolution. "Selfish" means self to the exclusion of other selves. When the individual expands his idea of "self" to include growth with other beings, the concern is less with fulfilling individual desires, and more with the obligations which each being has for all. As understanding of self proceeds, the concern becomes one of serving needs rather than psychic appetites. That is, glimpsing the nature of evolution helps create a purpose and destiny for the individual man and leads to the establishment of mental and moral standards of thought and action. From efforts to live a life of purpose and growth through relations with others, responsibility to and for others naturally flows. The soul whose perception is so unenlightened as to allow preoccupation with one unit to the exclusion of all others is "selfish," because constricted by an erroneous and particularized concept of the meaning of Self. His motivation disregards the total karmic situation.

That this total "karmic situation" must be served by the individual, is the perception of the wise man or philosopher. It flows gradually through willingness to serve particular karmic situations, into a concept of self that becomes truly "selfless"—the knowledge that from the heights of highest wisdom not one of the interdependent units of the ocean of life can be served without reference first to the needs of All Selves. For the greatest of wise ones, perfected in the knowledge *we* are seeking to gain, there is no concept of self at all—self is the whole—the beginning, the end, the one great purpose. All the smaller and seemingly contradictory purposes of individuals or groups become at last meaningful, because of an understanding of their hidden unifying factor.

This indicates why the Teachers of Theosophy have pointed to selflessness as a higher state than that of unselfishness. Unselfishness represents that great effort within a being to determine correctly his relations with others. The "selfless man" no longer deals with two factors in evolution—self and other selves—but sees the purposes and needs of the whole as a unity. This state of mind is more than mind, for it involves a direct rather than indirect expression of the spiritual nature. From this highest pinnacle of wisdom the gradations run down and through those striving to become selfless through the natural practice of unselfishness; to those who still find a certain pride in their own unselfish qualities, and hence are yet bound and involved by egoism; to those who cultivate an apparent unselfishness which is mere desire for admiration; coming finally to the individual who consciously aligns all action with personal desires.

When any being refuses to admit interdependence with others who are karmically a part of his present "total situation" in evolution, he begins to traverse the path to final personal destruction. Growth always is and must be growth through and with others. Failure to recognize this even in small part leads to the annihilation of "personality" because the position assumed retards rather than accelerates evolution.

The self, then, as individual, inaugurates all progress and all retrogression. All action begins with self and for all action self is responsible. The consequence of one assuming this consciously is an ever-widening horizon of mutual learning for all those near to him and for himself; the consequences of selfishness, of avoiding all self-responsibility, are a gradual divorce from the whole world of meaning and purpose. Therefore, "selfish" and "unselfish" signify more than loose terms of moral shortsightedness and excellence; they indicate the grade in evolution of any being—not age, but degree. And

it is not we, as humans, who assure to anyone certificates of merit or demerit by assigning these terms, but rather it is that the whole sweep of evolution reacts positively or negatively to the "unselfish" or "selfish" individual through the operation of law that is as natural as it is just. Therefore, it is impossible to understand the terms "selfish" and "unselfish," and reason from them, until questions involving the meaning and purpose of living have been evaluated from the standpoint of Universal Evolution.

THE MISSION OF SORROW

The wisdom of the ages explains the cause of sorrow. It teaches that each being is spirit; that the power of spirit is illimitable, although we limit it because we assume that it is limited; that the changeless spirit in the heart of every being is behind every form, the cause and sustainer of all forms; that spirit is the force behind evolution, and also the force that rules and relates all things of whatever grade; that every being is the result of an unfoldment from within outwards—of a *desire* for greater and greater expression. But we who have reached this stage of self-consciousness, unlike the lower kingdoms, now have the *power of choice* and can draw upon that illimitable source of our being and realize it while we live in a mortal and ever-changing body.

Desire, in a limited way, with regard to the personality, is the cause of all sin, sorrow, and suffering. Such desire is based on selfish thought; it is not what others desire; it heeds not any other urge than its own. The unfulfilled desires, it is, that hurt us; yet do the fulfilled desires give us happiness? Never, for so soon as they are achieved, there begins a further desire for something more, something greater. With many conflicting desires, then, we live upon each other, we prey upon each other, we devour each other, we injure each other—in every way. There is no necessity for all this. It never was the original plan—the original nature of the development of man. There is never any need to desire. All our woes are self-inflicted; the very inherent power of spirit has plunged us into them and maintains us in them.

Yet misery, sorrow and suffering have a mission. It is usually only the misery we bring upon ourselves that makes us stop doing wrong, to look around and ask and see what is right. It is by our mistakes we learn to see the difference between right and wrong, and in seeing that difference is the whole story of progress. *We have to be able to tell the difference.*—R.C.

SCIENCE NEWS AND NOTES

I: Intuition in Action

The New York *Times* comments editorially on the suggestion that science borrow intuition from the poets and use it (see January issue, p. 133):

> Igor Sikorsky talked to the American Society of Mechanical Engineers the other day on the part that intuition plays in invention. A mystical term is this "intuition," as mystical as MacDougall's "instinct of contrivance." To Mr. Sikorsky intuition is a kind of second or inner sight that can be developed like a muscle.
>
> Without the gift of creative imagination—Mr. Sikorsky's intuition—we can have no Leonardos, no Newtons, no Edisons, no Darwins. Creative scientists, poets and inventors of machines have it. How far it can be cultivated no one knows. Probably it is a part of the human composition, a family trait, as we see in the Berthelots, de Sausures, Bachs, Darwins, Huxleys, Berthollets—something as hereditary as blond hair or blue eyes. But imagination is not enough. An inventor must also have a technical heritage—accumulated knowledge. For lack of that Leonardo could not design an airplane that would fly. Edison as a caveman would have invented not the phonograph but some weapon more effective than the contemporaneous spear or stone hatchet. Given this technical heritage, imagination and an irrepressible urge, and invention follows inevitably.
>
> Mr. Sikorsky's distinction between discovery and invention is one that is no longer commonly held. Discoveries are made when relationships are seen—a process quite akin to invention. Newton's work in gravitation was therefore highly inventive, and so was Darwin's. In both discovery and invention we have the same evidence of imagination, the same flashes of what is called "genius." Most of the tales of these flashes are apocryphal. Newton was not prompted to discover the laws of gravitation because an apple supposedly fell on his head; he had applied himself to the subject for years. Howe said that the eye-pointed needle came to him in a dream, whereupon he perfected his sewing machine. As a matter of fact, he had been brooding over his problem for months. Kékulé saw the benzene ring in a flash while riding on top of a London bus; but he, too, had long been pondering on the structure of molecules. Ideas thus explode only after a long process of incubation. "Intuition" does not help us much to understand why and how the explosion occurs.
>
> Though he is himself aware of the highly speculative character of his explanation, we must be grateful to Mr. Sikorsky for having once more focused attention on a profound mystery. We have had

> too few attempts to approach this problem of invention mechanistically. In other words, we must measure imagination and discover, if we can, why it is that the mentally gifted see relationships to which others are blind. Until we study invention in this mechanistic way we can do no more than theorize—which is a kind of invention in itself (New York *Times,* Dec. 25, 1942).

We are not prepared to agree with the *Times* editor, that "most of the tales of these flashes are apocryphal," for the reason that there exists too much evidence in modern times to substantiate the theory of "hunches." Ten years ago, 1450 scientists were questioned on this subject, and half reported they had had the experience occasionally, a third frequently, and only 17 per cent not at all (THEOSOPHY XX, 136). It is no argument against the reality of intuition to point out that "technical heritage" or accumulated knowledge is necessary, or that "ideas thus explode only after a long process of incubation." No inventor, no "genius" of the scientific variety will deny that extensive study is a necessary preliminary. Indeed, the report referred to stated that all the scientists questioned agreed—

> that there must be a long period of investigation of data, then a period of assimilation of facts until the mind has grasped them perfectly, and then a season of complete mental rest. It is during this rest that the hunch comes bursting in a flash as if heaven-sent (XX, 137).

As for approaching the problem "mechanistically," that is just what it is impossible to do. Facts and data could be assembled, but nothing less than an *intuitive perception* would bring understanding.

While awaiting such an illuminating flash on the nature of intuition, we call a distinguished witness to the bar, Circuit Court Judge Joseph C. Hutcheson, Jr., reputed to be "one of the ablest jurists in the country."

> Judge Hutcheson of Houston, Tex., is one of the frankest jurists in the United States, with the best sense of humor.
>
> Discoursing on the sanctity of the law in the Cornell Law Review, Judge Hutcheson wrote:
>
> "I set down boldly that I, 'even as your other worships do,' invoke and employ hunches in decisions.
>
> "I, after canvassing all the available material at my command, and duly cogitating upon it, give my imagination play and, brooding over cause, wait for the feeling, the hunch—that intuitive flash of understanding which makes the jump spark connection between question and decision.
>
> "And more, 'lest I be stoned in the street' for this admission, let me hasten to say to my brothers of the bench and of the bar, 'my practice is the same as your other worships'." (Los Angeles *Daily News,* Dec. 31, 1938.)

From an even more eminent source comes further appreciation of this "mystical term." On the day following publication of its views on "Intuition and Invention" the *Times* reported Dr. Irving Langmuir's address as retiring president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Dr. Langmuir, who is a Nobel Prize winner and associate director of the General Electric Research Laboratory, said in part:

> In the complicated situations of life we have to solve numerous problems and make many decisions. It is absurd to think that reason should be our guide in all cases. Reason is too slow and too difficult. We do not have the necessary data or we can not simplify our problem sufficiently to apply the methods of reasoning. What then must we do? Why not do what the human race always has done—use the abilities we have—use common sense, judgment and experience. We under-rate the importance of intuition.
>
> In almost every scientific problem which I have succeeded in solving, even after those that have taken days or months of work, the final solution has come to my mind in a fraction of a second by a process which is not consciously one of reasoning. Such intuitive ideas are often wrong. The good must be weeded out from the bad—sometimes by common sense or judgment—other times by reasoning. The power of the human mind is far more remarkable than one ordinarily thinks. We can often size up a situation, or judge the character of a man by the expression of his face or by his acts in a way that would be quite impossible to describe in words.
>
> People differ greatly in their ability to reach correct conclusions by such methods. Our numerous superstitions and the present popularity of astrology prove how often our minds make blunders. Since we have to live with our minds, we should train them, develop them, censor them—but let us not restrict them by trying to regulate our lives solely by science or by reason (*Science,* Jan. 1).

Only in the theosophical teachings will be found the explanation requested by the *Times,* of *why and how the explosion occurs.* William Q. Judge, who as a public lawyer and a private Teacher was pledged to give justice where justice was due, has described the process and its rationale:

> . . . but few thinkers do any original thinking. They pride themselves on doing so, but in fact their seeking minds go out all over the world of mind and take from those of slower movement what is good and true, and then make them their own, sometimes gaining glory, sometimes money, and in this age claiming all as theirs and profiting by it (THEOSOPHY VI, 538).
>
> [The Adepts] have all the truths that could be desired, but at the same time are able to guard them from the seeking minds of those who are not yet ready to use them properly. But they often find the

hour ripe and a scientific man ready, and then touch his cogitating mind with a picture of what he seeks. He then has a "flash" of thought in the line of his deliberations, as many of them have admitted. He gives it out to the world, becomes famous, and the world wiser. This is constantly done by the Adepts, but now and then they give out larger expositions of Nature's truths, as in the case of H. P. B. This is not at first generally accepted, as personal gain and fame are not advanced by any admission of benefit from the writings of another, but as it is done with a purpose, for the use of a succeeding century, it will do its work at the proper time. . . .

[The Adepts] have only to voluntarily and consciously connect their minds with those of the dominant thinkers of the day to at once discover what has been or is being worked out in thought, and to review it all. This they constantly do, and as constantly incite to further elaborations or changes by throwing out the suggestion in the mental plane so that seeking and receptive minds may use it (THEOSOPHY VI, 489).

All the great philosopher-scientists used intuition and taught its presence in all men, says H. P. B.:

Plotinus, the pupil of the great Ammonius Saccas, the chief founder of the Neo-platonic school, taught that human knowledge had three ascending steps: opinion, science, and *illumination.* He explained it by saying that "the means or instrument of opinion is sense, or perception; of science, dialectics; of illumination, *intuition,* (or divine instinct). To the last, *reason is subordinate;* it is absolute knowledge founded on the identification of the mind with the object known". . . .

Every human being is born with the rudiment of the inner sense called *intuition,* which may be developed into what the Scotch know as "second sight." All the great philosophers, who, like Plotinus, Porphyry, and Iamblichus employed this faculty, taught the doctrine. "There is a faculty of the human mind," writes Iamblichus, "which is superior to all which is born or begotten. Through it we are enabled to attain union with the superior intelligences, to being transported beyond the scenes of this world, and to partaking the higher life and peculiar powers of the heavenly ones" (*Isis* I, 434-5).

THE PROBLEM INSOLUBLE

AS far back as recorded history goes, the mass of mankind has sought the end of sorrow in arrangements and rearrangements of matter. As the net resultant it is now engaged in the most gigantic rearrangement of all time, having thus far gained therefrom the most widespread sorrow of the ages. And when at the end it lies exhausted for the time being, will it see Heaven any nearer?

Granted that some day the globe may rest at peace beneath a "parliament of man, a federation of the world," and that all children may have enough milk to bathe in, let alone to drink—is that the end of sorrow? Substantial masses of men have reached all this from time to time. Were they happy?

Life has its fulfillments. The small child with a much-longed-for toy; the romantic maiden in the arms of her lover for the first time; the engineer listening to the dedication of his first great bridge; the politician taking the President's oath—all have reached the highest pinnacle of their dreams. But all, even in the glow of exultation, sense the creeping realization that pinnacles exist only because there are valleys on *both* sides.

In a single blink of the Eye of Eternity, young laughter is one with silence, and young love is one with the dust; beauty fades under the very touch of the loving hand; at the end of a few brief seasons, which race with ever-increasing speed, Self is again alone with its memories.

A man sits by his own fire, surrounded by loving wife and children whose laughter forms a wall against the sorrows of a world outside; yet well does he know that all this is moving steadily, inexorably out of his grasp; unrelenting, unresting, to be stayed or held by no power in this Universe.

The tragedy of history is that of the indomitable human will struggling against eternal loss and decay; battling to infuse permanency into the impermanent.

The search for "perpetual motion," or the jest of lifting oneself by the bootstraps, is precisely of the nature of this problem. To be happy in and through matter requires that there be no pain or want, no memory of what has been, and no fear of future loss. This only the animal achieves, in those moments, and those moments only, when its stomach is full and its hide is warm. Self-conscious beings have times of pleasure which they call happiness; brief, changeable, impermanent.

Why? Because consciousness is not a material thing and man is not a material being. Encased in a form of matter so tightly that no other life is known, he is a homeless exile whose only respite lies in hope.

Delusion leads him, an eternal being, to try to imbue the non-eternal with his own quality and thus to find in it a home forever. Matter is his experience, not his fulfillment; it exists solely by the equal balance of the opposites, pleasure and pain, and in the end that balance is all he can reap from it. The incessant effort to dig himself permanently into the ever-changing, the ceaseless endeavor to stabilize mortality—these are roads to unrest and anguish, not to bliss.

A man can be happy in matter, but not because of matter nor because of any arrangements he has made with it. He can be happy when he has succeeded in completely relinquishing it as a quest and has set about observing it as a phenomenon detached from Self. For then to the native birthright of free consciousness, which *is* bliss, he may add the enjoyment of creation without attachment to results, and the Universe in all its infinity is then to him an ever-becoming, upon none of whose changes does he *depend* in any way. Nor does he even depend upon its existence at all for anything that he needs for himself. What else than happiness can then be his lot?

In all the manifest worlds there is no joy equal to that which follows liberation after long travail toward the light; the bliss that comes with the first sure and certain knowledge that the Self depends upon nothing, needs nothing, fears nothing. This is the realm where he is to meet the *Reality* in those fleeting forms that he has struggled ever to hold, and ever has lost.

FREEDOM OF THE MODERN MAN

He has become free from the external bonds that would prevent him from doing and thinking as he sees fit. He would be free to act according to his own will, if he knew what he wanted, thought and felt. But he does not know. He conforms to anonymous authorities and adopts a self that is not his. The more he does this, the more powerless he feels, the more he is forced to conform. In spite of a veneer of optimism and initiative, modern man is overcome by a profound feeling of powerlessness which makes him gaze toward approaching catastrophes as though he were paralyzed.

—*Erich Fromm*

WHAT BECOMES OF THOUGHTS?

IT has been said that "thoughts are things," an assertion with which I am prepared to agree entirely; and I also firmly believe that the time is not far off when their substantiality will be recognized and understood by science more fully than at present.

A thought implies many things besides pure force exerted. If force is exerted, then there must be that which exercises it. What is this, and what is the effect of the exercise? When we think, it is known that there is a disturbance or disintegration of the grey matter of the brain. But next we must observe that there is at the same time physiological disturbance, change, or alteration in the whole frame. For instance; a thought of shame or disaster or punishment may bring all over the body a hot flush or a cold shiver; the thought of a great danger just escaped has made men dizzy and women faint. Is there nothing in this? Further, each thought makes a picture, save perhaps a purely metaphysical syllogism, but even there it is difficult to escape the formulating by the mind of some concrete illustration as the syllogism proceeds; and even in pure mathematics it will be impossible for the thinker to prevent the rising up of a picture of the figures used in the operation, because from youth the numerals were impressed on his memory. Going on with this, we see that clairvoyants report that each thought makes a flash or picture objective to the inner sense, and from all the experiments in hynotism we find that the old claim of occultism that each thought makes a definite picture must be true. Every clear seer will confirm this from personal experience. Still further; the astral light being a preserver of these pictures like a photographic plate, it follows that every thought has its picture preserved, and by that means what has been done or is being done may be known unerringly. Therefore thoughts, while they may be fugitive so far as concerns the thinker, are not so otherwise, but persist as seeds for good or evil in the whole race.

But, still more, every thought leaves a seed in the mind or manas of the thinker, no matter how fugitive the thought was. The whole sum of such small seeds will go to make up a larger seed for thought, and thus constitute a man of this, that, or the other general character. Thoughts, then, are highly important, for, as the Buddha said, we are made up of thought and built of thought; as we think, so we act and will act, and as we act and think so will we suffer or rejoice, and the whole world with us.

—W. Q. J., *Theosophical Forum,* February, 1894.

AMONG YOUTH-COMPANIONS

"AT this season, we might consider the question of Mr. Judge's place in the Movement," announced King, as the group assembled around the fireplace. "It is a question that continues to be raised, usually by newcomers, but sometimes also by those of longer acquaintance with the work and the teaching. Max, for instance, had the problem posed to him quite recently. Tell us about it, Max, and then we can go ahead and discuss it."

"I was asked," Max reported, "why we give Mr. Judge preference over all the other followers of H. P. B. This questioner says he has studied Madame Blavatsky's writings, and finds they suit his own needs admirably just as they are. He wants to know why there should be any further instructions. He does not understand why Mr. Judge is linked so closely to H. P. B., nor why 'Mr. Judge's interpretations of Theosophy,' as he calls them, should be part of the Teachings of Theosophy, when those of other theosophists are not."

"I'd say that can't be reasoned about—it just has to be seen and felt!" exclaimed Gail. "Wouldn't it be like trying to prove the very ground you are standing on? How could you even think of the Movement *without* W. Q. J.?"

"It does seem strange to us, perhaps, for we are not of the generation which had to 'discover' Mr. Judge, so to speak," King replied. "We *began* by accepting him as co-worker and co-founder of the present Theosophical Movement, and as we have grown to see and study on our own, that original idea has simply been strengthened and confirmed. We know, however, that there have been and are those who do not 'accept' H. P. Blavatsky, who find it possible to affirm the Message, while denying the Messenger. That is something that needs far more attention than we can give it now. Why not plan to talk about it at another meeting?

"For the present, however, we will assume that acceptance of Theosophy requires recognition of the Source from which it came, and of the Agent who brought it. But there are also those who profess to follow H. P. B., while questioning the status of Mr. Judge. To reply to such a view, we must justify our faith in Mr. Judge. Conscious knowledge is immeasurably firmer than unreasoned belief, and this is a good opportunity for us to go over the 'Judge question'."

"Well, the first piece of 'evidence,'" began Janice, "might be H. P. B.'s own statement that to William Q. Judge was due the life of the Theosophical Society. Mr. Judge, writing of the origin of the T. S., gave Madame Blavatsky and Col. Olcott as 'the two

chief agents,' but this may be taken in the same sense that we accept H. P. B.'s references to Col. Olcott as the 'President-Founder.' Habitual self-effacement was one of Mr. Judge's outstanding characteristics, and showed him to be a master of the power 'to appear as nothing in the eyes of men.' In the numerous crises of the Society, there were many who put themselves forward. The attitude of Mr. Judge, on the other hand, pointed up H. P. B.'s words, 'Follow not me, nor my path, but the path I show.' In this respect, he was certainly unique among H. P. B.'s 'followers.' "

"That same quality inheres in his writings," Dave contributed. "Throughout all his articles, and many letters, there can be found no trace of doubt or question of the teachings given by the Messenger of the nineteenth century. He never departed in the slightest degree or particular from the recorded message. Among all those who wrote on Theosophy, he alone refrained from editing, correcting, adding to, or revising the Teacher's word. That also is an unique record."

"Wait a minute," broke in Max. "That was one of the points my friend raised. He said Mr. Judge *had* added to and revised the teachings of H. P. B. He mentioned as an example, Karma and Reincarnation. They were emphasized out of all proportion by Mr. Judge, he says, whereas they are only *part* of H. P. B.'s teaching."

"What did you say to that, Max?" asked King. "Did you quote from the *Five Messages:* 'Learn, then, well the doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation'?"

"I did," replied Max, "but first, I asked him to think why Mr. Judge taught Theosophy the way he did. He did not try to give new ideas, or make Madame Blavatsky's ideas exciting or fascinating. Just the opposite. He wrote to show how Theosophy helped you to live a better life. In this he was following H. P. B.'s own definite instructions in her messages to American Theosophists, for she urged many times that they concentrate not on psychic phenomena, but on altruism and brotherhood. She said this was the only thing which would save the coming races. And since brotherhood is based on law, that meant to study the laws of Karma and Reincarnation. So Mr. Judge did just that, giving almost a third of the *Ocean* to them."

"You might also have brought up something else H. P. B. told the Western Theosophists," suggested Alayne. "That is, her statement that W. Q. J. was the link between the West and the East; that for those who desired to reach and understand the Eastern esoteric knowledge she brought, W. Q. J. was the 'bridge.' When we remember that the *Gita* was said to be his favorite book, and that

his is the rendition of that ancient Hindu scripture best suited to Western minds, we can appreciate something of what she meant."

"And what about his loyalty to Madame Blavatsky?" asked Martinez. "Who else constantly and consistently defended her? What other had complete faith and absolute trust in her, no matter what the 'appearances' were? Who but W. Q. J. gave her unreserved devotion, unconditional honor and respect? The answer we get from her own lips: she called him 'her only friend'."

"We have also to consider his theosophical work," said Gail. "If we were to pick out the most serious theosophical worker, either during or after H. P. B.'s time, we should be compelled, in all fairness, and in justice to the facts, to select Mr. Judge. No one excelled him in single-pointed consecration to straight theosophical activity. Up to the last hour of his life, when, although still a comparatively young man, his body was fast wasting away, he never ceased to work strenuously and practically for Theosophy and the Theosophical Movement. It is reported of him that if his associates managed to relieve him of one task, in order that he might rest a little, he used the time thus gained to devise a new activity!"

"Perhaps we could summarize what has been said so far," King stated, "by saying that Mr. Judge deserves to stand with Madame Blavatsky as Co-Messenger, because he made her life, work and teaching the example and inspiration of his own life, work and teaching. He not only saw the lines laid down, as few others did, but he *followed* those lines, *as none other did.*"

"And isn't that his greatest contribution to the Theosophical Movement?" Janice commented. "He made plain the vision of the Messenger, of all the Messengers of the Masters, for that matter, because he lived the life that proved the doctrine."

"Interesting, by the way, that he did the same thing with Thomas Paine's vision," Dave offered. "Mr. Judge was a citizen, in fact, of that republic of brotherhood that the Founding Fathers dreamed of evolving on this continent. Actually, wasn't it W. Q. J. who said that the American Republic is the symbol of the new era?"

"And think of his many hints about the new race to appear here," Gail reminded them. "He described it as one of glorious powers, which would make altruism the central ideal of life. But he didn't only *talk* about it, he himself was that new man, the man of the next cycle. To those who knew him best he was the *spiritual* theosophist.

"Don't you think," she finished musingly, "that W. Q. J. was the one who lifted high the 'torch of Liberty of the Soul of Truth' so that all could see it and benefit by its light?"

THE MORAL LAW OF COMPENSATION

By An Ex-Asiatic*

"For thou shalt be in league with the stones of the field; and the beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee." Job, Chap. V, v. 23, Christian Bible.

AS a Western Theosophist I would like to present to my Indian brethren a few thoughts upon what I conceive to be the operation of the Law of Compensation in part, or, to put it more clearly, upon the operation of one branch of this law.

It seems undeniable that this law is the most powerful, and the one having the most numerous and complicated ramifications of all the laws with which we have to deal. This it is that makes so difficult for a human spirit the upward progress after which we all are striving, and it is often forced upon me that it is this law which perpetuates the world, with its delusions, its sadness, its illusions, and that if we could but understand it so as to avoid its operation, the *nirvana* for the whole human family would be an accomplished fact.

In a former number a respected brother from Ceylon, speaking with authority, showed us how to answer the question so often asked: "Why do we see a good man eating the bread of poverty, and the wicked dwelling in riches, and why so often is a good man cast down from prosperity to despair, and a wicked man after a period of sorrow and hardship made to experience for the balance of his life nothing but success and prosperity?" He replied that our acts in any one period of existence were like the arrow shot from the bow, acting upon us in the next life and producing our rewards and punishments. So that to accept his explanation—as we must—it is, of course, necessary to believe in re-incarnation. As far as he went, he was very satisfactory, but he did not go into the subject as thoroughly as his great knowledge would permit. It is to be hoped that he will favor us with further essays upon the same subject.

I have not yet seen anywhere stated the *rationale* of the operation of this law—how and why it acts in any particular case.

To say that the reviling of a righteous man will condemn one to a life of a beggar in the next existence is definite enough in statement, but it is put forward without a reason, and unless we accept these teachings blindly we cannot believe such consequences would follow.

---

*W. Q. Judge, F. T. S. [Note.—This early article by Mr. Judge, published five years before he founded *The Path*, appeared originally in *The Theosophist*, Oct., 1881. —Eds.]

To appeal to our minds, there should be a reason given, which shall be at once plain and reasonable. There must be some law for this particular case; otherwise, the statement cannot be true. There must occur, from the force of the revilement, the infraction of some natural regulation, the production of some discord in the spiritual world which has for a consequence the punishment by beggary in the succedent existence of the reviler. The only other reason possible of statement is, that it is so ordered. But such a reason is not a reason at all because no Theosophist will believe that any punishment, save that which man himself inflicts, is *ordered*. As this world is a world produced by law, moved by law, and governed by the natural operation of laws which need no one to operate them, but which invariably and unerringly operate themselves, it must follow that any punishment suffered in this way is not suffered through any order, but is suffered because the natural law operates itself. And further, we are compelled to accept this view, because to believe that it was *ordered,* would infer the existence of some particular person, mind, will, or intelligence to *order* it, which for one instant no one will believe, who knows that this world was produced, and is governed, by the operation of number, weight and measure, with harmony over and above all.

So then we should know in what manner the law operates, which condemns the reviler of a righteous man to beggary in his next existence. That knowledge once gained, we may be able to find for ourselves the manner and power of placating as it were this terrible monster of compensation by performing some particular acts which shall in some way be a restoration of the harmony which we have broken, if perchance we have unconsciously or inadvertently committed the sin.

Let us now imagine a boy born of wealthy parents, but not given proper intelligence. He is, in fact, called an idiot. But instead of being a mild idiot, he possesses great malice which manifests itself in his tormenting insects and animals at every opportunity. He lives to be, say, nineteen and has spent his years in the malicious, although idiotic, torment of unintelligent, defenceless animal life. He has thus hindered many a spirit in its upward march and has beyond doubt inflicted pain and caused a moral discord. This fact of his idiocy is not a restoration of the discord. Every animal that he tortured had its own particular elemental spirit, and so had every flower that he broke in pieces. What did they know of his idiocy, and what did they feel after the torture but revenge. And had they a knowledge of his idiocy, being unreasoning beings, they could not see in it any

excuse for his acts. He dies at nineteen, and after the lapse of years is reborn in another nation—perchance another age—into a body possessing more than average intelligence. He is no longer an idiot, but a sensible active man who now has a chance to regenerate the spirit given to every man, without the chains of idiocy about it. What is to be the result of the evil deeds of his previous existence? Are they to go unpunished? I think not. But how are they to be punished; and if the compensation comes, in what manner does the law operate upon him? To me there seems to be but one way, that is through the discord produced in the spirits of those unthinking beings which he had tortured during those nineteen years. But how? In this way. In the agony of their torture these beings turned their eyes upon their torturer, and dying, his spiritual picture through the excess of their pain, together with that pain and the desire for revenge, were photographed, so to speak, upon their spirits—for in no other way could they have a memory of him—and when he became a disembodied spirit they clung to him until he was reincarnated when they were still with him like barnacles on a ship. They can now only see through his eyes, and their revenge consists in precipitating themselves down his glance on any matter he may engage in, thus attaching themselves to it for the purpose of dragging it down to disaster.

This leads to the query of what is meant by these elementals precipitating themselves down his glance. The ancients taught that the astral light—*Akasa*—is projected from the eyes, the thumbs and the palms of the hands. Now as the elementals exist in the astral light, they will be able to see only through those avenues of human organism which are used by the astral light in travelling from the person. The eyes are the most convenient. So when this person directs his glance on any thing or person, the astral light goes out in that glance and through it those elementals see that which he looks upon. And so also, if he should magnetise a person, the elementals will project themselves from his hands and eyes upon the subject magnetised and do it injury.

Well then, our re-incarnated idiot engages in a business which requires his constant surveillance. The elementals go with him and throwing themselves upon everything he directs, cause him continual disaster.

But one by one they are caught up again out of the orbit of necessity into the orbit of probation in this world, and at last all are gone, whereupon he finds success in all he does and has his chance again to reap eternal life. He finds the realization of the words of Job

quoted at the head of this article: he is in "league with the stones of the field, and the beasts of the field are at peace with him." These words were penned ages ago by those ancient Egyptians who knew all things. Having walked in the secret paths of wisdom, which no fowl knoweth and the vulture's eye hath not seen, they discovered those hidden laws, one within the other like the wheels of Ezekiel, which govern the universe. There is no other reasonable explanation of the passage quoted than the theory faintly outlined in the foregoing poor illustration. And I only offer it as a possible solution or answer to the question as to what is the *rationale* of the operation of the Moral Law of Compensation in that particular case, of which I go so far as to say that I think I know a living illustration. But it will not furnish an answer for the case of the punishment for reviling a righteous man.

I would earnestly ask the learned friends of the Editor of the THEOSOPHIST to give the explanation, and also hint to us how in this existence we may act so as to mitigate the horrors of our punishment and come as near as may be to a league with the stones and the beasts of the field.

"THE HEART'S RESIGNATION"

We must be ready to say at any moment under whatever circumstances, whether expected or unexpected: "It is just what I in fact desired." For only those ideals can be dissipated which rest upon a lower basis than the highest aim, or which are not in accord with Nature's law. And as our aim ought to be to reach the supreme condition and to help all other sentient beings to do so also, we must cultivate complete resignation to the Law, the expression and operation of which is seen in the circumstances of life and the ebb and flow of our inner being. All that can be gotten out of wealth, or beauty, or art, or pleasure, are merely pools of water found along our path as it wanders through the desert of life. If we are not seeking them their appearance gives us intense pleasure, and we are thus able to use them for our good and that of others just so long as the Law leaves them to us; but when that superior power removes them, we must say: "It is just what I in fact desired." Any other course is blindness. All the passing shows of life, whether fraught with disaster or full of fame and glory, are teachers; he who neglects them, neglects opportunities which seldom the gods repeat. And the only way to learn from them is through the heart's resignation; for when we become in heart completely poor, we at once are the treasurers and disbursers of enormous riches. —W. Q. J.

THE LUSTRE OF ISSA

IT is told of the Mohammadan Issa (Jesus) that with his advent into it, the assembly received new lustre and freshness. Yet, these could not have come from the eloquence of Issa, nor from new astounding metaphysical ingenuities that he set forth for the delectation of intellectual palates. For Issa was a simple man, who said that to know the Truth, one must become as a little child. Whence, then, came his light? What made his words a continuous delight and refreshment like a new flowing spring of sweet waters?

The words of ordinary men pass and are forgotten, yet they too have a light. It is the light of cleverness in facile speech—the light of mind engaged in earthly things, in things that pass. This is another light than Issa's. His light is from the source of all light, the inexhaustible light of formless worlds, which sees the purpose and intention and the cause in worlds of form. For all that, is Issa a stranger, blind in the world of form? Quite otherwise; his is the glance that pierces through the subtle sophisms of the clever, sees the shadows cast by bright insinuating words spoken in self-interest. His light is clear in this world as in the other worlds.

Issa lived 2,000 years ago. Has no Issa been since then? There may be a few still on the earth today, who remember of their youth how one Mr. Judge came into an assembly, addressed by "great occultists," who propounded of the Logoi, and Nidanas, of Nirvana, and of the Pitris, while many nodded, not to approve, but in weariness of effort to hear and follow the learned discourses. Could Mr. Judge himself say anything so learned?

Though he could, he would not. He spoke of great things simply, but with his light, so that the scholar, too, saw beneath the bare bones of the structure of the teaching that these great things were vital to the texture of his very being. For the time, Mr. Judge woke his light to shine—a light to be remembered, were it never to be lit again.

One record still exists of how this friend of all men's minds spoke once in an assemby, with unstudied words on the most profound of subjects—"Cyclic Impression and Return and Our Evolution." Some now read the words and fail to see how, falling like fresh rain, they woke seeds of thought long lain fallow in the dry dust of intellectual molds; how his light revealed pictures of the past and of the future—

now our present—to eyes gazing calm and full upon it. Light from the formless world of Spirit does not require molds, nor can be contained within them. But, there are others, to whom this record makes plain the Issa as of old, who came and by his lighted words gave lustre and freshness to that assembly, such as had not been for it till then.

INFINITE RICHES OF SOUL

Converse with a mind that is grandly simple, and literature looks like word-catching. The simplest utterances are worthiest to be written, yet are they so cheap, and so things of course, that in the infinite riches of the soul, it is like gathering a few pebbles off of the ground, or bottling a little air in a phial, when the whole earth, and the whole atmosphere are ours. The mere author, in such society, is like a pickpocket among gentlemen, who has come in to steal a gold button or a pin. Nothing can pass there, or make you one of the circle, but the casting aside your trappings, and dealing man to man in naked truth, plain confession and omniscient affirmation.

Souls, such as these, treat you as gods would; walk as gods in the earth, accepting without any admiration, your wit, your bounty, your virtue, even, say rather your act of duty, for your virtue they own as their proper blood, royal as themselves, and over-royal, and the father of the gods. But what rebuke their plain fraternal bearing casts on the mutual flattery with which authors solace each other, and wound themselves! These flatter not. I do not wonder that these men go to see Cromwell, and Christina, and Charles II., and James I., and the Grand Turk. For they are in their own elevation, the fellows of kings, and must feel the servile tone of conversation in the world. They must always be a godsend to princes, for they confront them, a king to a king, without ducking or concession, and give a high nature the refreshment and satisfaction of resistance, of plain humanity, of even companionship, and of new ideas. They leave them wiser and superior men. Souls like these make us feel that sincerity is more excellent than flattery. Deal so plainly with man and woman, as to constrain the utmost sincerity, and destroy all hope of trifling with you. It is the highest compliment you can pay. Their "highest praising," said Milton, "is not flattery, and their plainest advice is a kind of praising."

—EMERSON

ON THE LOOKOUT

"Gems of Therapeutic Wisdom"

The New York *Herald Tribune* (Jan. 3) prints a letter on Paracelsus by Dr. Bernard Aschner, who writes:

> In the works of Paracelsus which I translated into modern German (publ. 1926-32, Gustav Fischer, Jena, 4 vols.) are to be found many gems of therapeutic wisdom even that have been erroneously discarded and forgotten.
>
> Paracelsus practised venesection, that life-saving form of blood-letting first mentioned in an anecdote found in many textbooks of the history of medicine, relating how Podalirius, son of Aesculapius, mythical god of medicine, after the Trojan War (about 1200 B. C.) successfully treated a case of cerebral concussion and fracture of the skull sustained by the daughter of a king in Asia Minor. Blood-letting, which was practised throughout antiquity, during the Middle Ages, and up to about 100 years ago, and had fallen into disrepute for reasons too long to relate here, has come into its own again in recent years. In the last war, gassed soldiers have often been saved merely by draining away some ten ounces of blood. Donors to blood-banks during the present war not only experience no ill effects but actually enjoy particularly good health after undergoing venesection.

We take exception to Dr. Aschner's statement that blood donors "experience no ill effects." The "evidence" that blood transfusion is either efficient, desirable, or harmless, is to say the least, inconclusive. The reader may recall the case of the professional blood donor, who felt pain in his arm whenever a person to whom he had given blood died. (Reported in Lookout, April, 1940. On blood types and transfusion, see Theosophy xv, 384.)

Venesection versus Transfusion

Paracelsus may have practised blood-*letting,* but on a principle altogether different from the modern theory of blood *transfusion.* The Paracelsian doctrine is suggestive:

> The *Mumia* [*Kama-Rupa* in the Theosophical nomenclature] of any creature, according to Paracelsus, is closely connected with the blood stream. Hence any substance taken into the blood stream makes a direct magnetic connection between the *Mumia* of the person receiving the substance and the *Mumia* of the animal or person

from whom it was taken. This throws an interesting light on the subject of blood-transfusion, vaccination and the various inoculations now so prevalent. For, as Paracelsus points out: "The *Mumia* coming from the body of a person or animal continues to remain in sympathetic relationship with the *Mumia* contained in such a person, and they act magnetically upon each other." This is called the transplantation of diseases, "and many practices of sorcery are based upon that fact." (THEOSOPHY XXVI, 202.)

BLOOD MAGIC

Writing on the "magical properties of blood," H. P. B. says in *Isis* (II, 567):

> Blood begets phantoms, and its emanations furnish certain spirits with the materials required to fashion their temporary appearances. . . . Paracelsus writes that with the fumes of blood one is enabled to call forth any spirit we desire to see; for with its emanations it will build itself an appearance, a *visible* body—only this is sorcery.

PARACELSUS AS MEDICAL SCIENTIST

Dr. Aschner's letter continues:

> Cardiac conditions, high blood pressure, diseases of the stomach, kidney and gallstones, arthritis, and many other ailments were treated successfully by Paracelsus and his contemporaries, employing treatments long since discarded by modern medicine, but many of which could be used effectively today.

Madame Blavatsky, who called Paracelsus "the greatest Occultist of the middle ages," and "the cleverest physician of his age," had much to say about his work as a *medical magician* in the true sense. She wrote in 1877:

> As Ampère served to introduce Avogadro to our contemporary chemists, so Reichenbach will perhaps one day be found to have paved the way with his OD for the just appreciation of Paracelsus. It was more than fifty years before molecules were accepted as units of chemical calculations; it may require less than half that time to cause the superlative merits of the Swiss mystic to be acknowledged. . . . The primal causes of the diseases afflicting mankind; the secret relations between physiology and psychology, vainly tortured by men of modern science for some clew to base their speculations upon; the specifics and remedies for every ailment of the human body —all are described and accounted for in his [Paracelsus'] works. Electro-magnetism, the so-called *discovery* of Professor Oersted, had been used by Paracelsus three centuries before. This may be demonstrated by examining critically his mode of curing disease. Upon his achievements in chemistry there is no need to enlarge, for it is admitted by fair and unprejudiced writers that he was one of

the greatest chemists of his time. Brierre de Boismont terms him a "genius" and agrees with Deleuze that he created a new epoch in the history of medicine. The secret of his successful and, as they were called, magic cures lies in his sovereign contempt for the so-called learned "authorities" of his age. (*Isis* I, 163-4.)

And in *The Secret Doctrine* (I, 263) we read:

The knowledge of these primary causes [of disease] and of the ultimate essence of every element, of its lives, their functions, properties, and conditions of change—constitutes the basis for MAGIC. Paracelsus was, perhaps, the only Occultist in Europe, during the last centuries since the Christian era, who was versed in this mystery. Had not a criminal hand put an end to his life, years before the time allotted him by Nature, physiological Magic would have fewer secrets for the civilized world than it now has.

"AURUM POTABILE"

The *Tribune* letter continues:

Paracelsus was able to cure the severest forms of crippling arthritis. He used not only a great many effective vegetable drugs but also preparations of gold such as we are trying to use today. Our present-day gold injections are still risky and not always effective, but Paracelsus used his famous *aurum potabile,* an organic compound of gold which was taken orally without harmful effect and which cured different forms of severe arthritis. Moreover, Paracelsus claimed that any treatment of arthritis must work two ways: internally by resolving drugs, and externally by strong draining counter-irritants applied directly to the skin at the painful spot.

On the *aurum potabile,* we find the following suggestive passage:

. . . though Van Helmont [pupil of Paracelsus] may have concealed, under the name "seminal virtues," his knowledge of the fact that elementary substances have their original properties, which the entering into compounds only temporarily modifies—never destroys—he was none the less the greatest chemist of his age, and the peer of modern scientists. He affirmed that the *aurum potabile* could be obtained with the alkahest, by converting the whole body of gold into salt, retaining its seminal virtues, and being soluble in water. When chemists learn what he meant by *aurum potabile,* alkahest, salt, and seminal virtues—what he really meant, not what he said he meant, nor what was thought he meant—then, and not before, can our chemists safely assume such [superior] airs toward the fire-philosophers and those ancient masters whose mystic teachings they reverently studied. (*Isis* I, 192.)

Also in *Isis,* H. P. B. discusses the alkahest, showing that it is "no fiction" (I, 50-1).

"THE WORLD MOVES"

That Paracelsus, so long derided and maligned, should be taken up with such evident appreciation and reverence is encouraging. (See THEOSOPHY XVIII, 571; XXVIII, 138; XXIX, 378, 519, for earlier signs of this development. Also, the "Studies on Paracelsus," X, 218, etc.) All of which is in accordance with one of H. P. B.'s prophecies:

> The world moves in cycles. The coming races will be but the reproductions of races long bygone; as we, perhaps, are the images of those who lived a hundred centuries ago. The time will come when those who now in public slander the hermetists, but ponder in secret their dust-covered volumes; who plagiarize their ideas, assimilate and give them out as their own—will receive their dues (*Isis* I, 51).

"NO UNIMPORTANT SERVICE"

Professor John Maxson Stillman, in his *Paracelsus* (reviewed in Lookout for Jan., 1940) gives an interesting note on a more obscure "theory" of Paracelsus:

> It was also no unimportant service that Paracelsus rendered to medical science in attributing to natural rather than to the mystical influence of devils or spirits such nervous maladies as St. Vitus's dance. It is doubtful perhaps if his influence in this direction was very immediate upon contemporary thought, at least if we may judge from the sad history of the trials, tortures and executions of witches during a century after the activity of Paracelsus. . . .
>
> A distinguished student of the history of science, Andrew D. White, thus characterizes the services of Paracelsus in this direction:
>
> "Yet, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, cases of 'possession' on a large scale began to be brought within the scope of medical science, and the man who led in this evolution of medical science was Paracelsus. He it was who first bade modern Europe think for a moment upon the idea that these diseases are inflicted neither by saints nor demons, and that the 'dancing possession' is simply a form of disease of which the cure may be effected by proper remedies and regimen" (p. 120-1).

"MYSTERIOUS POWER"

Belief in "the mystical influence of devils or spirits" is of the character of a universal superstition. Nor is it without philosophical foundation, as shown by the theosophical teachings on the *Kama-Rupa* (psychic shell), and the elementals. But no longer are individuals on, in or through whom this mystical influence works, regarded as "witches" and burned. A current motion picture is at least faintly credulous of the powers of "witches," and a recent case in Los Angeles may be said to demonstrate modern "technique" in dealing with "witchcraft." From the Los Angeles *Times* (Jan. 5):

Strange stories of unexplained happenings were told last night by Norma Moore, 13, who apparently has been made the object of caprice—or coincidence—by a mysterious power.

"Doings of a Shadow World"

Vases and cups smash against walls and break in her presence, ash trays are found several feet away from their proper location, a spool of thread three times flew upward from a table against a wall, a spoon apparently transferred itself from a sink to beneath a kitchen table, a bar of soap left its bathroom niche and was found on the kitchen floor.

Norma tells of these things herself and is corroborated by adult relatives, some of whom became frightened at incidents which might have been the doing of a shadow world.

"A Student of Mystery"

The following day's paper reported:

Norma Moore's supposed mysterious power which causes inanimate objects to transfer themselves from place to place in her presence remained unexplained last night after she had been subjected to a series of tests by an expert in psychic phenomena.

The 13-year-old girl whose strange magnetism became apparent a month ago in Ventura still was bewildered by her experiences, but was unable to demonstrate the weird incidents for Dr. Robert H. Heger. [The psychic manifestations had stopped before Dr. Heger arrived, having lasted only several days. Norma had no previous experiences of this sort, and has now returned home to Arizona.—Eds.]

. . . Dr. Heger, nationally known student of mystery, arranged what amounted to a seance in an attempt to have Norma control her wild talent.

"An Inexplicable Physical Force"

Carefully he explained to Norma that she possessed unusual and mysterious energy—something wholly unrelated to spiritualism or ghosts, but rather an inexplicable physical force found in only few persons in the world having the proper glandular balance.

"It is nothing to be afraid of," he told her. At present, he said, her power generates itself within her body and is unleashed at certain times entirely uncontrolled.

Dr. Heger referred to other similar cases, mostly in European countries, where strange super-physical forces expressed themselves through certain individuals acutely attuned to them.

"Although these cases are, of course, unusual," Dr. Heger said, "they are not unnatural. Norma may outgrow this force, or she may learn to control it. But it cannot hurt her.

> "The reason it strikes sporadically and at scattered objects is that she now has no control over it. It is the difference between concentration and day-dreaming."

Dr. Heger's point, that Norma's experience is unusual, but not unnatural, is well taken, and his emphasis on the fact that the power was uncontrolled is to be commended. With the present accent on mediumistic practices and passive meditation, recognition of the virtue of *control* is a healthy reaction.

"THE TRUE MAGNETIC AURA"

Many similar examples of uncontrolled physical energy in a human being are recounted by Catherine Crowe in *The Night Side of Nature,* especially, Chapter XVI on the Poltergeist (racketing spectre). The instance given at great length by H. P. Blavatsky in "Nature's Human Magnets" (reprinted in THEOSOPHY VI, 35), presents a striking parallel to Norma Moore's case, and the reader is urged to compare the two accounts for himself, as space does not permit the correlation to be made here. H. P. B. concludes:

> But we may at once say that since Reichenbach proves magnetism to be a compound instead of a simple force, and that every human being is charged with one of these forces, Odyle; and since the Slade experiments, and the phenomena of Russia and St. Paul, show that the human body does also at times discharge the true magnetic aura, such as is found in the lodestone; therefore the explanation is that in these latter abnormal cases the individual has simply evolved an excess of the one instead of the other of the forces which together form what is commonly known as magnetism. *There is, therefore, nothing whatever of supernatural in the cases.*

THE AMERICAN TYPE

Under the heading "The Physico-psychological American Type," H. P. B. writes:

> As for America being overflowed with sensitives and mediums, the reason for it is partially attributable to climatic influence and especially to the physiological condition of the population. . . . Of what country in the world do the women's constitutions bear comparison with the delicate, nervous, and sensitive constitutions of the feminine portion of the population of the United States? (*Isis* II, 18-19.)

MAGNETISM AND ELECTRICITY

A few years ago two biologists reported that "if the electricity from the blood cells of a full-grown man could be made to pass through a twenty-five-watt electric bulb, he could read by its light for at least five minutes" (THEOSOPHY XXIV, 576). "Magnetic

currents develop themselves into electricity upon their exit from the body," observes Madame Blavatsky, who gives another note on the subject in "Electric and Magnetic Affinities Between Man and Nature":

> In the systems of certain people the accumulation and secretion of electricity, reach under certain conditions, to a very high degree. This phenomenon is especially observed in cold and dry climates, like Canada, for instance; as well as in hot, but at the same time, dry countries (THEOSOPHY VI, 518).

Other child psychics were noted in Lookout for May, 1939. As mentioned in these pages last June (XXX, 383), it is important to remember that the cycle of Spiritualism in the forties of the last century, began *with children*. Psychic manifestations, such as Norma Moore's, are thus in part the return of impression of a hundred years ago. Further, it is impossible to consider this situation as unrelated to other "juvenile" problems reviewed last month (pp. 181-4).

"IMMUTABLE LAWS OF THE UNIVERSE"

We reprint in full a letter published under the above title in the New York *Sun* (Sept. 5, 1942). The letter is a clear exposition of the law to which Theosophy gives the Sanskrit name, *Karma:*

> Everything that happens to a man is the result of something that he has done or fails to do. Man is as he thinks he is, and what he does is the result of the sum total of his thoughts. We are in expression and unfoldment just what we think. This is the law and it is immutable.
>
> We live in a universe governed throughout by perfect laws that work with entire equity and marvelous accuracy in all places and conditions. The condition of the present is always the natural outcome of the past. It is absurd to blame chance. Every action and thing has its laws. Man living with the highest aims, ever as best he can, in continuous harmony with them, is a success, no matter what statistics of failure a nearsighted and half-blind world of critics and commentators may lay at his door. In truth, it is safe to say that many a man who has acquired wealth, fame and professional success has really failed; he may have had a certain amount of pleasure, not real happiness. But the man who has trained himself to have an affectionate, happy life at home cannot possibly be a failure, even if he is poor in money and mediocre in business accomplishments.
>
> If a man has become a drunkard, or a drug addict, or a criminal, it is because he believes, consciously or unconsciously, that he will thereby find the greatest amount of satisfaction and happiness. If he is dishonest in his business or private life, or stoops to questionable or corrupt political policies, it is because of a mistaken belief that he

can achieve success and happiness by such methods—seemingly ignorant of the law which declares that eventually they will destroy him body and soul. False reasoning leads him in the wrong direction, and he will blame every one but himself for the penalty meted out to him. In every case, however, the choice is his, for man is a free moral agent. The result is always because of something that he has done or has failed to do.

"THE SECRET AND CAUSE" OF CONDITIONS

If circumstances had the power to bless or harm, they would bless and harm all men alike, but the fact that the same circumstances will be alike good and bad to different people proves that the good or bad is not in the circumstance, but only in the mind of him that encounters it. Every condition of life is, therefore, bound up in an orderly and harmonious sequence, and the secret and cause of every condition is contained within itself. The law, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap," operates in every field of human endeavor.

The incidents of every human life, which both make and mar, are drawn to it by the quality and power of its own inner thought life. Every soul is a complex combination of gathered experiences and thoughts, and the body is but an improvised vehicle for its manifestation. What, therefore, your thoughts are, that is your real self. Consequently, it is self-evident that health and happiness can be maintained only by clean thinking and clean living. And it holds without argument that moral conduct must be preceded by moral thinking.

THOUGHT'S "SPECIFIC GRAVITY"

Man is a free moral agent and rises or falls according to the specific gravity of his thought. The power of thought perverted is crime. Used properly it is a virtue, but an outraged conscience, a violation of the moral law, hate, envy, anger, fear and selfishness destroy vitality and leave man exposed to illness. All the baser passions are destroyers of health, whereas faith, hope, love and unselfishness are the most powerful factors in restoring harmony and health. Over 1,900 years ago the Great Teacher and Master Physician demonstrated the law that we must first heal the mind and soul before we can heal the body.

Ignorance of the law rather than inherent depravity is responsible for most of the woes of humanity. In proportion as the established order is truly interpreted, ills will disappear. Man cannot change the law, but he can adjust his life so that his actions, for which he must

assume full responsibility, are in harmony with the highest ethical principles.

The realm of infinite justice is for no far-off place or time. It is here; it is all about us; it is working today as it has worked during all past days and generations. It metes out to all pain or blessing by a law inconceivably exact. It is impossible to escape its judgment. The law of life and happiness is as a straight and narrow path. The therapeutic value of righteous living is one of the most remarkable discoveries of modern psychology. There is no variation in infinite law. Everything that happens to a man is the result of something that he has done or fails to do.

New York, September 1. HERMAN S. ROSENBAUM

"IDEALS"

Along the same lines is the following anonymous paragraph from a scientific journal:

As you think, you travel; and as you love, you attract. You are today where your thoughts have brought you; you will be tomorrow where your thoughts take you. You cannot escape the result of your thoughts, but you can endure and learn, can accept and be glad. You will realize the vision (not the idle wish), of your heart, be it base or beautiful, or a mixture of both, for you will always gravitate towards that which you, secretly, most love. Into your hands will be placed the exact result of your thoughts; you will receive that which you earn; no more, no less. Whatever your present environment may be, you will fall, remain, or rise with your thoughts, your vision, your ideal. You will become as small as your controlling desire; as great as your dominant aspiration (*Journal of the American Institute of Homeopathy,* Sept., 1942).

DO WE REMEMBER?

Diarmuid Russell, whose "Experiment with the Imagination" was reviewed in the January Lookout, has a short article in the *Reader's Digest* (Jan., 1943):

During my childhood in Ireland my old nurse believed the stories she told me about leprechauns and fairies. Later a scientific education gave me a certain amount of skepticism. Yet there are a number of occurrences, odd beyond rational explanation, which I believe true since they happened to people very close to me.

When my mother was ten years old she visited her grandmother in an old house at Oxfordshire, England. The first night she was awakened by a sound and, going to the window, saw a man digging by the garden wall. When she told about it the next morning the

adults smiled at the child's imagination. The next night she again saw the man digging. When she mentioned it in the morning she was told with some irritation that she mustn't make up stories. She could see for herself that the ground was undisturbed. As time went by, my mother became almost hysterical, for each night she saw the man digging. To convince the child, her grandmother had the spot dug up—and found a pot of coins dating from the time of the Great Plague of London in 1665. People had fled the city with what wealth they could carry but many of them had already contracted the plague and died, as must have the owner of the pot.

"A LATENT MEMORY"

Another story was told me by a close friend. She was on a bicycling tour of the British Isles with schoolmates. One day they were going up a hill when one of the girls turned pale and stopped, saying, "It's silly, but I know exactly what's on the other side of this hill." She described a church and a church-yard, here a clump of trees, another over there, and houses beyond the trees. When they came to the top of the rise the scene was exactly as described. It might have been a latent memory if the village had been one of which postcards had been made. But it was a small, obscure place. In the churchyard, later on, my friend found several gravestones almost 200 years old which carried the girl's family name. The incident suggested what later was found to be true: that this village, quite unknown to the girl or her family, had been the home of some of her ancestors.

Mr. Russell calls them "Things I Can't Explain," but theosophists recognize them as reminiscences of former lives on earth, to be added to many such instances of personal remembrances already noted. (See *The Eternal Verities,* p. 167: "Do We Remember?" Also THEOSOPHY XIX, 365; XX, 372; XXVII, 523, 528.)

"REINCARNATIONISM"

Strictly speaking, however, the doctrine of reincarnation is not "proved" by these instances, for they are, most likely, the return to another body of the *personality* that lived before on earth in a different form. Reincarnation is essentially a teaching of *soul* reëmbodiment, wherein the Reincarnating Ego, or *Manas,* not the Kamic or personal nature, returns to new birth. In ordinary cases, the Ego has new body, new brain and new personality. The lower man thus retains no "memory of former lives," for the good and sufficient reason that, being a fresh combination of the Ego's tendencies and capacities on lower planes, "it," the personality, is innocent of past existence. This distinction it was, incidentally, which, imperfectly

understood by some critics of *Isis Unveiled,* gave rise to the myth that H. P. B. did not teach Reincarnation in her first book. The fact is that the Kardec School of "Reincarnationists" represented practically the only popular knowledge of the doctrine existing in the West when *Isis* was written. And, by her own statement, H. P. B. "meant to upset the theory of the French Reincarnationists who maintain that the same *personality* is reincarnated, often a few days after death, so that a grandfather can be reborn as his own granddaughter." (*Isis Unveiled,* Centenary Anniversary Editon. Los Angeles: The Theosophy Company, 1931. Publisher's Preface, p. iv.)

"WHAT WERE WE BORN *For*?"

It is more or less of a theosophical truism to say that suffering and trial prompts a man to ask, *Why?*—to seek a philosophy which will explain not only the cause of sorrow, but the purpose of living. A truism generally runs the risk of oblivion: we are apt to let it drop out of the active area of our minds, as something we "know," that requires no further consideration. But the educational value of adversity is a fact difficult to forget for long, in the very nature of things, and especially is this so during a period of crisis such as the present. One of the many "reminders" is a letter written by a young airman in the Royal Air Force to his Member of Parliament, which reads in part:

> If nothing else happens when you join up, at least you do meet reality. You lose all the pretences of artificial living. In this way I have suddenly seen that my life is meaningless. I mean your life as well—everyone's life. I have become obsessed by the futility of things. I see this same thing in the faces of my R. A. F. companions down here. I have seen it in the eyes of my wife. We are all bilking the one frightful question: What were we born *for*?

With the loss of "the pretences of artificial living" (we usually call it "normal" living) we do meet reality, for we pierce the illusion of physical plane existence, and see it for *a thoughtless, selfish jogtrot.* Then the question naturally arises, Is this *all* there is to life? If so, then certainly life is meaningless, and there is no escape from "the futility of things."

"NURSERY YARNS"

The average man, however, cannot accept this view in his heart, no matter how "logical" it seems. He much prefers to believe that there is a purpose in life:

> I want a faith. I must have a faith and it's no use bringing out nursery yarns about God. I am going through a phase in which I don't believe in God. I don't believe it is just a phase, either. And

> yet without God, or something to trust in, there's only endless loneliness. . . .
>
> What am I living for? *Why?* In my heart I know what the answers are.

We have indeed outgrown the "nursery yarns about God" that satisfied a childish faith in a Big Good Man who would protect us from harm, fight our enemies, generally make Himself useful in adversity,—and scarce in prosperity. Our consciousness has grown "global," and so our religion must graduate to universality and embrace all men alike. No tribal god can serve us, or save us, now. In place of a "Big Brother Religion" we require a philosophy of responsibility, of *man's* responsibility. We must find in every man, not in an extra-cosmic deity, the godhood we can trust.

"GRAND READING"

> The Churches. They can't answer. They seem to me to be chasing round their own private squirrel-cages without reference to realities. . . . The Sermon on the Mount is grand reading, but you can't obey it and at the same time make a living selling motor accessories. I know because I've tried. . . . Even to call us "Christians" strikes me as blasphemy. . . .
>
> I am writing you to publicize this vast bluff, this pretence that we are born to some noble (but unidentified) purpose. And also, perhaps, with the feeble hope that someone can show me something imperishable to believe in before I go up for my first trip in a reconnaissance plane really on the job (*Magazine Digest,* Dec. 1942).

To every open-minded theosophist, this letter is a challenge, to be met with the philosophy of Theosophy. The questions raised by this man are the questions Life is presenting to an ever-widening circle of fellow souls. These are the questions that attest the primal importance of the "practical exposition of ethics" so earnestly recommended by William Q. Judge, as in "What Our Society Needs Most" (reprinted in the January issue). Unless Theosophy can be shown, *by theosophists,* to provide a reasonable and satisfying explanation of man's fundamental problems, and unless, at the same time, it can be demonstrated that Theosophy gives a self-compelling reason for right action, Theosophy too will be dismissed as merely "grand reading," Isis will be re-veiled, and universal brotherhood will again retreat to Utopia. Ours is the trust and the responsibility to see that the present Theosophical Movement accomplishes its aim, that the efforts of the last Messengers be finally crowned with success. We, not They, can insure that this cycle be an upward one, spiralling back to the true order of the ages.